DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 605 CG 006 249

TITLE	An Exemplary Cooperative in Elementary School Guidance for Small School Districts. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Monroe School District 103, Wash.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	27p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Elementary School Counselors, *Elementary School Guidance, *Guidance Programs, Individual Development, *Inservice Teacher Education, Program Descriptions, *Program Evaluation, Teacher Influence
IDENTIFIERS	Monroe, Title III, Washington

ABSTRACT

This project was designed to provide a new, comprehensive, and sophisticated guidance program to meet the needs of pupils and teachers in nine school districts. The major purpose of the program was to maximize the development of each child, and broadly stated its functions included the following: (1) inservice activities to extend and enrich teachers' understanding of areas such as changing goals and behavior and diagnostic cues, (2) counseling with groups and individuals, (3) working with parents of problem children, (4) arranging for referrals to other community agencies when necessary, (5) evaluating the program, and (6) disseminating information concerning the program. The common philosophical core that undergirds the entire counseling program was that the role of the elementary counselor was that of a facilitator of the learning process; consequently, the central role of the teacher was constantly kept in mind. In order to assess the effects of the program, a descriptive model was utilized. At the conclusion of the program, after federal funds were no longer available, only two of the participating districts dropped elementary school counseling. The research reported herein was funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (Author/RSM)

EDO 48605

67-3140
OE/HESE
T.H. VII
C G

RECEIVED
Division of Plans and Supplementary
Centers - - Central File
1-11/5

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 006 249

Monroe School District No. 103
Monroe, Washington

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
* * * * *
AN EXEMPLARY COOPERATIVE
IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE
FOR SMALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Funds Provided Through
P. L. 89-10, Title III

Verne Fankhauser
Project Director

1967 - 1969

INTRODUCTION

Amid this complex field of education there seems to be one point upon which all educators can agree. That point is: all education - elementary, secondary, and institutions of higher learning - exist to serve the student. Thus, it seems that all energies of the entire staff, both academic and administrative, are directed toward the broad goal of educating the student. From the kindergarten through the college or university the over-all purpose of the school is to develop the potentialities of the students as individuals. Toward this end Humphreys, Traxler, and North remind us that, "...the school should provide students with backgrounds of knowledge as broad and deep as they are able to assimilate, provide the commonly accepted fundamental skills they will need in adult life, and generally help the immature become mature, responsible, self-sufficient members of society."[1]

In order to achieve goals such as stated above a number of small school districts banded together in a cooperative effort to provide their school population, K-6, with specialized services, hitherto unavailable, by employing the services of four elementary guidance personnel through the aid of federal support.

Description of Geographical Area to be Served

The area served was geographically contiguous, including seven school districts and two school systems in King and Snohomish Counties in western Washington. The area lies on the western slopes of the Cascade Mountains

---

[1] J. Anthony Humphreys, Arthur E. Traxler, Robert D. North, Guidance Services. Chicago, Illinois: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1967, page 4.

with most of the territory between districts covered by forest and agricultural lands. Mountains, rivers, and streams isolate the districts to some degree and also provide some problem in inter-district travel and communication.

What industry there is in Snohomish and King Counties lies to the west of the Monroe area where the ground gives way to the waters of Puget Sound. To the north is less populous Skagit County and to the south is the metropolitan Greater Seattle.

The area is bound together by certain common economic and social characteristics. It is largely rural with agriculture and forest products industries being major land uses. The middle and lower-middle classes predominate, with a larger than average number of economically and culturally deprived families included in the population.

The major cultural resources are found in the cities of Everett (pop. 50,000) to the west, and Seattle, a city with a population of approximately 600,000. Four colleges and universities are located nearby: the University of Washington, with an enrollment approaching 30,000 students; Seattle Pacific College; Seattle University; and Western Washington State College. There also exists a community college in the City of Everett.

Services were transported to each of the districts from Monroe with time loss in travel and transportation of personnel and equipment kept at a minimum.

PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES

The intent of this project was to provide a new, comprehensive, and sophisticated program in elementary school guidance which, when fully realized, would meet the needs of pupils and teachers in nine cooperating school systems. Broadly, its functions included the following: (1) in-service teacher training which extended and enriched the teachers' understanding of such areas as individual differences, diagnostic cues, tests and measurements, influencing the child, understanding the child's life style, changing goals and behavior, discipline, cumulative records, and recording and using anecdotes; (2) counseling with groups and individuals; (3) working with parents of children who have problems and improving parent-child relationships; (4) arranging for referrals of children to other community agencies when the needs of the child are beyond what could be provided for the child in the school setting; (5) continually evaluating the program as a measure of effectiveness; and (6) disseminating information concerning the program.

The major purpose of this program was to maximize the development of each child. It was felt there was a real need for earlier identification and effective handling of the adjustment problems of children. The elementary school program was not intended to be a mere repetition of high school guidance, but considered the specific characteristics of children and recognized the role and relationships of the elementary teacher to the class.

Methodology

As stated above, the population touched by this program resided largely in Snohomish and King Counties and included seven school districts and two

parochial schools which presented a combined K-6 school population of approximately 2,264 students in 1966-67. By the end of the grant period, the student population had expanded by almost 500 to 2,746. See Table I. This, of course, resulted in an increased work load for the counselors.

The distribution of the participants served by the program was 29 per cent rural farm and 71 per cent rural non-farm.

TABLE I
Student (K-6) Enrollment

District	1966-1967 Enrollment	1968-1969 Enrollment
Monroe	981	1256
Sultan	385	455
Granite Falls	315	410
Cathcart	234	319
Gold Bar	92	133
Skykomish	74	72
Index	20	16
Monroe Christian	100	48
Sky Valley Academy	63	37

Within the nine school systems included in this proposal there were:

1. Two-hundred and fifteen families earning less than $1,000 per annum.

2. Four-hundred and twenty-three families earning between $1,000 and $1,999.

3. Four-hundred and eighty-one families earning between $2,000 and $2,999.

4. Fifth-four people living in the area designated in the proposal have had no formal education.

5. Three-hundred and fifty-seven have had only one to four years of schooling.

6. One-thousand, one-hundred, and sixty-two have had between five and seven years.

7. Two-thousand, four-hundred, and fifty-five have under eight years of formal schooling.

The counselors were divided among the schools in such a manner as to take into account both the number of students assigned and also the geographical location. The eventual assignments were as follows:

TABLE II
Counselor School Assignments

	Counselor	School & District	1966-1967 Population
No. 1	Mrs. Stanton	Frank Wagner - Monroe	510
		Sky Valley Academy (Pvt.)	63
			573
No. 2	Mr. Newgard	Central - Monroe	345
		Maltby - Monroe	126
		Gold Bar	92
		Monroe Christian (Pvt.)	100
			663
No. 3	Miss Murdock	Granite Falls	315
		Cathcart	234
			549
No. 4	Mr. Foltz	Sultan	385
		Skykomish	74
		Index	20
			479

TABLE IIA
Counselor School Assignments

	Counselor	School & District	1968-1969 Population
No. 1	Mrs. Stanton	Frank Wagner - Monroe	670
		Sky Valley Academy (Pvt.)	37
		Monroe Christian (Pvt.)	48
			755
No. 2	Mr. Newgard	Central - Monroe	436
		Central - Sultan	331
			767
No. 3	Mrs. Cunningham	Cathcart	319
		Maltby - Monroe	150
		Startup - Sultan	124
			593
No. 4	Mr. McCulley	Granite Falls	410
		Gold Bar	133
		Skykomish	72
		Index	16
			631

The load assignments were arranged to take into consideration the amount of travel necessary. School assignments were changed over the previous years because of changes and shifts in school population.

The amount of time assigned to each of the schools varied as a function of its population. The assignments were as shown on Table III for 1966-1967, Table IIIA for 1968-1969.

TABLE III
Counselor Time Assignments - 1966-1967

Counselor	School	Days visited per week
No. 1	Frank Wagner	4.0
	Sky Valley Academy	.5
No. 2	Central	2.5
	Maltby	.5
	Gold Bar	1.0
	Monroe Christian	.5
No. 3	Granite Falls	2.5
	Cathcart	2.0
No. 4	Sultan	2.5
	Skykomish	.5
	Index	.5
	Startup	1.0

TABLE IIIA
Counselor Time Assignments - 1968-1969

Counselor	School	Days visited per week
No. 1	Frank Wagner	3.5
	Sky Valley Academy	.5
	Monroe Christian	.5
No. 2	Central - Monroe	2.5
	Central - Sultan	2.0
No. 3	Cathcart	2.0
	Maltby	1.5
	Startup	1.0
No. 4	Granite Falls	2.5
	Gold Bar	1.0
	Skykomish	.8
	Index	..2

One half day was taken by each counselor for weekly staff meetings held at the Monroe Administration Building. During these meetings, specialists were available for case staffing and consultation, and plans for the coming week were formulated.

ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE ELEMENTARY COUNSELOR

There existed a common philosophical core that undergirded the entire counseling program in this cooperative. Foremost among these was the conviction that the role of the elementary counselor was not that of a junior psychotherapist, but rather a person whose major goal was that of expediting the learning process. Thus, there must exist a vital working relationship between the counselor, the administration, and the classroom teacher. The program attempted to maintain the orientation toward every child in the program. In facilitating this belief the counselors attempted to serve those students who were experiencing minor learning and/or behavioral problems as well as those whose problems were somewhat more extreme.

In working toward these ends the central role of the teacher was constantly kept in mind, and every effort was made to aid in obtaining the over-all objective of the school.

Regularly scheduled appointments were set up with all the teachers to discuss any problems they might have. While it was important that each teacher feel free to either use or not use the service, it was also important that the guidance counselor have some opportunity to develop a relationship with the teachers so that they were able to choose whether they could benefit from the service or not. The counselor had to be aware of the time each teacher was available for consultation.

It soon became apparent that a major part of the counselor's work was to fill in the gaps in the teacher's education. Since typical teacher education programs did not provide the teacher in training with skills in handling guidance problems, the guidance counselor was forced to come up with real answers to meet the concerns of the teacher on the job. The

majority of the recommendations made had to give some solution for the problem or the teacher would not continue to come to him with her problems. The counselor soon realized that he could experience success only when recommendations were mutually developed, tested, and revised as the situation warranted such action. There was continuous opportunity for the counselor to check new theories and techniques in relationship to the laboratory of the classroom.

Aside from regularly scheduled appointments with the teachers, there was a provision for other in-service contacts. These contacts were facilitated through pre-school workshops, institute days, staff bulletins, and released time for professional meetings. A variety of topics were handled in such meetings and through written materials which were of concern to the staff. Opportunities for teachers to discuss mutual problems related to guidance were scheduled.

Throughout the grant period, the counselors kept a daily record of activities and contacts. Table IV shows a record of the counselor contacts for the 1966-67 year. Table IVA shows the number of contacts made in the 1968-69 school year. A comparison of the two charts shows some rather significant differences between activities in the first year and the third year of the grant period. The role and function of the members of the team seemed to differ considerably. This factor is, of course, somewhat to be expected as each counselor brings to this job his own particular personal philosophy. Then, too, each of the school systems and their teachers and administration provide a particular millieu in which the counselor must work. This demanded a certain amount of flexibility with those of the other professionals on the staff. The most obvious difference is the number of teacher contacts made. In 1966-67 the number of contacts was 725, in 1968-69 this increased to 2943, more than four times

as great. It was during these meetings that a great deal of informal in-service training took place. Information concerning individual difference, growth and development, helping teachers to understand the unique problems faced by the child, and help in planning for the child's learning experience all took place here.

Another area which increased at almost the same ratio was contact with administrators, 332 to 1240. This would indicate that (1) the teachers and administrators became more receptive and understanding as the program progressed, thus seeking aid from the counselor, (2) the counselors gained more confidence and ability in their work, making more contacts as a result of such, or (3) a combination of these two.

Family interaction with the school is generally a problem requiring considerable skill and tact. As stated earlier there was an expressed desire for this service by the principals of the various schools. During the first year of operation, the four counselors made 165 family contacts, during the last year, 350, the overwhelming majority of which were able to produce better school-home relationships. By the end of the first year parents were calling the school and asking for the services of the counselor. This trend continued throughout the three years.

An inquiry of the counselors as to why telephone contacts increased from 211 to 1007 revealed they were doing a great deal more in the areas of calling outside agencies and families. The telephone became a necessary substitute for personal contact as the counselor's work load increased over the three year period.

As the counselor became more diversified and knowledgeable in services offered, contacts in service to others increased from 167 to 491.

The counselors felt that, in general, their contacts--thus services--increased in those areas they felt most significant.

TABLE IV - DAILY LOG SUMMARY - 1966-1967
Results of the Activities of Four Counselors

	Item	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4	Totals
1.	Individual clients	412	381	222	90	1105
2.	Group Guidance	86	172	62	24	344
3.	Individual Testing	114	122	96	106	438
4.	Group Testing	30	4	53	50	137
5.	Teacher	311	178	114	122	725
6.	Administrator	104	89	103	36	332
7.	Director	60	20	39	14	133
8.	School Psychologist	87	37	38	26	188
9.	Health Services	48	26	20	4	98
10.	Family	55	41	52	17	165
11.	Telephone Contacts	95	63	18	35	211
12.	Others	39	45	66	17	167
13.	Dissemination Services	64	6	4	24	98
14.	In-service Training (self)	53	36	40	26	155
15.	In-service Training (others)	16	10	30	2	58
16.	Teacher's Meetings	28	19	15	19	81
17.	Classroom Observations	79	86	10		175
	TOTALS	1681	1335	982	612	4610

TABLE IVA - DAILY LOG SUMMARY - 1968-1969
Results of the Activities of Four Counselors

	Item	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4	Totals
1.	Individual clients	345	148	289	426	1208
2.	Group Guidance	23	26	16	50	115
3.	Individual Testing	102	94	98	134	428
4.	Group Testing	4	29	70	64	167
5.	Teacher	488	566	1097	792	2943
6.	Administrator	215	341	440	244	1240
7.	Director	152	77	55	112	396
8.	School Psychologist	67	77	50	78	272
9.	Health Services	41	31	65	52	189
10.	Family	56	59	187	48	350
11.	Telephone Contacts	12	29	786	180	1007
12.	Others	14	312	129	36	491
13.	Dissemination Services	14	81	7	68	170
14.	In-service Training (self)	15	21	37	16	89
15.	In-service Training (others)	12	2	5	6	25
16.	Teacher's Meetings	13	34	49	32	128
17.	Classroom Observations	28	16	184	76	304
	TOTALS	1601	1943	3564	2414	9522

The guidance counselor also aided the teacher in developing diagnostic skills through careful inspection and analysis of achievement test results. Instruments such as interest inventories, check lists, rating scales, and sociograms were used to give a better picture of each child. As the teacher became more effective in observing, she came to recognize the validity of learning principles. The counselor assisted her to see that each child needs to be understood in terms of the child's subjective view, that behavior is purposive, and that there exists a unity and pattern in the style of life for each child.

If, after thorough screening and consultation with the teacher, it was found the problem was not manageable, the counselor then accepted, for individual counseling, certain students. Most individual counseling contacts were designed to be short-term and goals were chosen by the teacher, counselor, and child which were felt would signify an acceptable change. Thus by forcing the choice of more realistic goals and providing concrete objectives upon which to focus, the percentage of counselor success was increased.

There were times when the needs of the child could not be met through the efforts of the counselor and the teacher. It then became necessary, through referral, to involve the school psychologist and/or other community guidance services with the child's problem. Through this process, it was hoped to focus all available facilities on the task of understanding the individual student; to understand him in terms of his self-concept, his environment, and his inter-personal relations, including relationships with his parents. Children who were in need of intensive, long-term counseling were referred to other agencies. The consultant assisted in making arrangements for them with other facilities.

Group counseling was another method which was used to spread the services and maximize the counselor's ability to reach more students. Some were handled directly by the guidance consultant. Some were selected who had specific problems which were similar and appeared to be best serviced through a group approach. Short-term goals such as classroom or playground behavior and study skills were often the target goal of the group.

In order to achieve the goal of cooperative thrust where all facilities of home, school, and community were focused upon the child, groups of parents were formed wherever possible into small discussion groups led by the counselor where problems of both a general and specific nature were confronted.

During these sessions, parents were allowed to express their fear and frustrations as well as their hopes and aspirations. Through the leadership of the elementary counselor, parents' insights were developed into clearer understanding of child growth and development patterns, learning patterns, and their over-all importance to school planning. They also were helped to a better understanding of school curriculum and how it develops. The over-all result seemed to be one of greater understanding of the role of the school and a deeper appreciation of the importance of home and school cooperation.

The final function that seemed to emerge was that of a resource person, not only for the teachers, but also for the administration and the surrounding community agencies. These people soon learned to rely upon the elementary guidance people for concrete information regarding the pupil point of view. It seems that more awareness of the actual needs of the pupil became a more important variable since the inception of the program.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In an effort to assess the effects of this program upon the life of the child in the various districts, a descriptive model was chosen rather than a statistical one. This was used principally because it was felt the problems inherent in the formulation of control groups, matching subjects, etc. would in some ways defeat the very purpose we set out to achieve, namely to expedite more effective learning in every child. Therefore, the results of the program will be presented in verbal and tabular form.

One recurring difficulty noted in the continuance of the grant period was the dropping of some teachers at the end of the school year and the addition of new teachers unfamiliar with the counseling program and its goals. This, however, did allow for an interesting phenomenon to be discussed later.

In the beginning each of the individuals chosen for the position of counselor was drawn from the teaching staff of the Monroe Public Schools. They were chosen with the understanding that they would each attend Eastern Washington State College during the summer session of 1966. Two--the director, Verne Fankhauser, and one counselor, Mrs. Stanton--were accepted into the N.D.E.A. Institute being held at EWSC during that summer; and the remaining three counselors, Mrs. Cunningham (nee Miss Murdock), Mr. Newgard, and Mr. Foltz enrolled in the regular summer session in guidance courses. Mr. Foltz was replaced in the third year by Mr. McCulley. who had nine years experience as teacher and head teacher and had attended an N.D.E.A. Institute for elementary school counselors.

Then these individuals were brought home and assigned to the various schools as indicated above. In-service meetings were held in each school during which time each elementary counselor was introduced to the building

administrator and the teaching staff. A visiting consultant discussed with them the hopes and aspirations held for the program and outlined a variety of ways in which they might be achieved. Each counselor was then coached in the techniques of establishing his role and the program began.

It so happened that in the course of assignment, some of the counselors were serving schools in which they had previously taught. In each instance in which this happened, some immediate resistance was felt among some of the staff--most principally arising from the older teachers, but not always.

At any rate, the first major hurdle encountered was the articulation of the counselor and his contribution into the on-going stream of events where the services had before not been present. The consultant came into play here meeting with groups of teachers--explaining how the counselor could be of value to them, emphasizing the fact that the counselor was an integral part of the teaching staff, and reminding them that the development of learning was everybody's business. He also met frequently, at first, with the administrators and gave support and counsel to them. He endeavored to show them how to make the most use of the services provided.

It was noted that in the schools where the building principal and/or head teachers were somewhat hesitant, the most teacher resistance was found. However, all buildings had some "hard core" resistance. This was principally found among the older teachers and was augmented to no small degree by the unsureness of the counselors themselves. The older and more aggressive teachers picked up this unsureness on the part of the new counselors and exploited it as much as possible. Where strong support was found among administration, this effect was minimized.

With the advent of each new school year, a number of new-to-the-district teachers came on the scene. These teachers almost universally utilized the services of the counselor to a larger extent than did the

teachers who had been in the various districts prior to the inception of the program. However, as a function of this use, the value of the counselor became better known; and others, formerly hesitant, began some tentative advances.

As the program progessed, the problems noted here became less evident. The resistance exhibited by teachers who were served by a counselor who had previously taught in their building decreased and all but disappeared. Administrators became more accepting as counselors proved their worth and value.

An evaluation by the principals of the counselors' services at the close of the first calendar year of service is included as follows in Table V. Table VA covers the 1968-69 year.

TABLE V
Evaluation By Building Principals - 1966-1967

1. Ranking of services administered by counselors.
   - A. Working with homes.
   - B. Teacher contacts.
   - C. Individual contacts.

2. Additional services desired.
   - A. Counseling chronically absent
   - B. More counselor time per school

3. Is enough counselor time provided for your building?
   - Yes 3
   - No 6

4. Do you feel this service will find its way into the permanent staffing of your district?
   - Yes 7
   - No. 2
   - Why? Do not see how it could be funded at present.

5. In which of the following skills do you find your counselor most proficient?
   - A. Behavior problems.
   - B. Teacher consultation.
   - C. Parent and community contacts.

6. Recommendations of principals for additional training for their counselors.
   - A. Tests and measurements.
   - B. Work in curriculum development.

TABLE VA
Evaluation By Building Principals - 1968-1969

1. Ranking of services administered by counselors.
   A. Individual contacts.
   B. Teacher contacts.
   C. Working with homes.

2. Additional services desired.
   A. More counselor time per school.
   B. More aid with placement of students.
   C. More in-service training for teachers.

3. Is enough counselor time provided for your school?
   Yes 3
   No 6

4. Do you feel this service will find its way into the permanent staffing of your district?
   Yes 7
   No 2

5. In which of the following skills do you find your counselor most proficient?
   A. Behavior problems.
   B. Teacher consultation.
   C. Parent and Community contacts.

6. Recommendations of principals for additional training for their counselors.
   A. More proficiency in dealing with behavior problems.

In 1966-67 working with homes was seen by the administrators as most important. Working with teachers was seen as next in importance. Individual pupil contact, while important, was rated third among the tasks the administrators thought were important contributions offered by their counselors.

The 1968-69 administrators ranked the services of the counselor in reverse order; i.e., pupil contacts, working with teachers, and working with parents. Since there were no changes in administrative personnel, it appears that after the first year the administrators were seeing the importance of the counselors' tasks in a different light.

The principals were asked to speculate on the continuance of the elementary guidance service in their district after the end of the funding period. Seven out of nine of those responding felt that it definitely would be included, while the remainder expressed a strong desire for it but did not know how the funding would be accomplished. The principals responded to this question the same in 1968-69 as they did in 1966-67.

When asked to evaluate the counselors' skills in 1966-67, the principals felt they were most skillful in handling behavior problems. Next, they felt came their work with teachers. Working with homes was felt by the principals to be the area in which the counselors were least skillful.

By 1968-69 the administrators found the counselors equally proficient in handling behavior problems, working with teachers, and working with homes.

Perhaps this proficiency in all areas has been due to the inservice training received by the counselors. This included social psychology and family dynamics and counseling. This was directed toward home-school relations rather than the more tradional aspects of family counseling as done by the social worker. The consultant was principally responsible for this training.

Other areas that administrators felt their counselors needed help in were the areas of test interpretation ("so they can be made more meaningful in the classroom") and curriculum planning. This was investigated further, and the apparent desire was that the counselor be a consultant "also" to the curriculum people. As the principal exponent of learning theory in the school, they felt the counselor should make a contribution here.

Classroom Teachers

A survey of the opinions of the classroom teachers was made in an effort to ascertain the effect of the counselor upon their work in the school. The teachers were requested to fill out the questionnaire without putting their names on it and turn it in to the school office. The counselors were not advised of the results except in global terms. However, each counselor met with the director and went over his work in his particular schools where this information was utilized. The results of the survey for the 1966-67 year are shown in Table VI. Those for 1968-69 are shown in Table VIA.

TABLE VI
Evaluation By Teachers - 1966-1967

1. Ranking of services administered by counselors.
   A. Diagnosis of learning difficulties.
   B. Aid with learning problems of individual students.
   C. Individual counseling.
   D. Administering group and individual tests.

2. Other services which would be of particular value.
   A. Coordinate learning activities.
   B. Diagnosis of achievement levels and ability.
   C. Parent-student counseling.
   D. Group guidance activities for entire classroom.

3. Ranking of counselor successes.
   A. Learning problems.
   B. Classroom behavior problems.
   C. Problems of social interaction.

4. Sufficiency of counselor time allotted to building.
   Yes 25
   No 32

5. Would more in-service training for teachers be of benefit to staff?
   Yes 51
   No 6

6. Is program beneficial?
   Yes 57
   No 0

TABLE VIA
Evaluation By Teachers - 1968-1969

1. Ranking of services administered by counselors.
   A. Individual counseling.
   B. Diagnosis of learning difficulties.
   C. Aid with learning problems of individual students.
   D. Administering group and individual tests.

2. Other services which would be of particular value.
   A. In-service training.
   B. Practical ideas for everyday situations in the classroom.
   C. Parent-student counseling.
   D. Complete follow-up for each problem.

3. Ranking of counselor successes.
   A. Learning problems.
   B. Problems of social interaction.
   C. Classroom behavior problems.
   D. Playground behavior problems.

4. Sufficiency of counselor time allotted to building.
   Yes 48
   No 23

5. Would more in-service training for teachers be of benefit to staff?
   Yes 48
   No. 20

6. Is program beneficial?
   Yes 65
   No. 1

When asked to rank a list of services provided by the counselor after the first year, the teachers answered as follows: (1) diagnosis of learning difficulties, (2) aid with learning problems of individual students, (3) individual counseling, and (4) administering group and individual tests. This may have been so due to the fact that the services of but one school psychologist was shared among all schools with the various counties helping occasionally with their school psychologists. Thus the counselors were often pressed into service in helping to more fully understand the child. We found that the demand for testing was more urgent when the program first began than it was toward the latter part of the first year. This might

be due in part to the teachers' lack of understanding of the counselor's role or perhaps to a sudden release of the backlog of hard-core cases which had been piling up for some time without any services available at all. Probably it was a combination of both. Most likely for some of the reasons mentioned above, the ranking of services changed by the end of the grant period. After the 1968-69 school year, the ranking was as follows: (1) individual counseling, (2) diagnosis of learning difficulties, (3) aid with learning problems of individual students, and (4) administering group and individual tests.

Question No. 2 asked the teachers if there were any services beyond those being offered that they felt the counselor should provide them. A large majority said, "none"; and what few did list suggestions asked for more individual help with specific or unique problems related to their particular room. Those asking for this were primarily new teachers. This was the situation at the end of the first year as well as at the end of the grant period.

The teachers were asked to rate the counselors' effectiveness on four general problem areas. They felt the counselors were most effective in handling learning problems. Next in order were problems dealing with classroom behavior. In third place were problems of social interaction. Ranked last was the counselor's skill in handling problems arising on the playground. In defense, however, it must be remembered that the counselors were not on the playground nearly as much as they would have liked, principally due to the necessity of having to move from school to school. Often their work was literally stacked up for them when they arrived, and they worked steadily until time to leave for the next school. Thus it was virtually impossible to function effectively on the problem of playground behavior. They did, however, work with teachers individually on

specific problems. Table VIA shows that after the 1968-69 school year, the ranking changed very little. The numbers by which the second and third items changed places was so small as to make the interchange insignificant.

It is recognized that the above problems are not mutually exclusive; and it was pleasing to see the teachers so aware of the counselor's role in the problem of learning, for it is felt that if learning can be expedited, many of the other behavior problems will begin to fall out or at least decrease in number.

Considering the amount of use the teachers made of the services of the counselor, teachers reported that when they encountered learning or behavior problems they overwhelmingly indicated that they called upon the counselor.

An interesting fact showed up when teachers were asked whether enough of the counselor's time was being allotted to their building. Most older teachers said, "yes"; and all but one of the newer teachers said, "no". This is in agreement with the counselors' own estimate wherein they felt the newer teachers were utilizing their services more effectively. Such was the case throughout the tree year grant period.

All but six of the teachers in the combined districts expressed a desire for in-service training in guidance. At the end of the 1966-67 year a stronger in-service program was instituted. All but 10 expressed the desire for further in-service work at the end of the program. It must be remember that during the three year period, there was quite a teacher turnover. It is conceivable that the needs of many of those who left their respective districts had been met. It is also possible that those who remained and experienced the in-service program wanted more of the same.

A majority of teachers polled listed the program as "very beneficial" and the balance with the exception of one described it as "somewhat beneficial" on a rating scale.

The development of lines of communication between the school and various community and county agencies was part of the assigned task of the counselors. Working relationships were established with surrounding schools of special education, the diagnostic and treatment facilities at the University of Washington, the Reading Clinic at Bothell, various county welfare units, and local law and medical persons. The cooperation between these and the school increased over 75 per cent during the grant period.

The following units were also utilized:

Public Health
Department of Public Assistance
    Child Protection
    Aid to Dependent Children
    Foster Child Care
Family Counseling
Child Guidance
Arlington Public Schools (Special Education)
Intermediate District No. 109
University of Washington Clinic VIII
Experimental Education Unit in Child Development Center,
    University of Washington

SUMMARY

Late in the 1964-65 school year a need for counseling services in the elementary school became a vocalized need. Seven districts in the Snohomish-King County region joined together into a cooperative effort with Monroe as the serving district to provide guidance services at the elementary level.

Eastern Washington State College was chosen as the cooperating institution. Its staff members aided in planning, operation, and evaluation and research.

The staff consisted of a project director, four elementary school counselors, a school psychologist, and consultant aid from the college level to serve a K-6 student population beginning at approximately 2000 students and growing ultimately to 2746. The districts ranged in size from 16 to 1256. Itinerant services were available to districts on a pro-rate time schedule. Weekly staffings with consultant aid provided for review of activities, reevaluation, and the establishment of new priorities as necessary.

The program attempted to maintain orientation toward every child in the program and recognized the importance of the central role of the classroom teacher. A major part of the counselor's work involved consultation with the teacher. The counselor was forced to come up with real answers to meet the concerns of the teacher on the job. The majority of recommendations made had to give some solution for the problem or the teacher would not continue to come to him with her problems. There was also provision for in-service contacts for teachers facilitated through preschool workshops, institute days, staff bulletins, and released time for professional meetings.

Group counseling was another method which was used to spread the services and maximize the counselor's ability to reach more students. Short term goals such as classroom or playground behavior and study skills were often the target goal of the group. Groups of parents also became the object of the counselor's practices. These groups were formed whenever possible into small discussion groups led by the counselor where problems of both a general and specific nature were confronted. The counselor also acted as a resource person, not only for the teachers, but also for the administration and the surrounding community agencies.

The first major hurdle encountered was the articulation of the counselor and his contribution into the on-going stream of events where the services had not before been present. The consultant came into play here meeting with groups of teachers, explaining how the counselor could be of value to them, emphasizing the fact that the counselor was an integral part of the teaching staff, and reminding them that the development of learning was everybody's business.

As to measuring the program's effectiveness, results of questionnaires and/or interviews gave valuable information. Administrators, as a whole, recognized the importance of the program and hoped it would become a part of their program even after federal funding was discontinued. Classroom teachers were surveyed to ascertain their opinions in regard to the effect of the counselor upon their work in the school. All felt the program was beneficial. The majority of the teachers expressed a need for more counselor time in their buildings.

At the conclusion of the program, after the federal funds were no longer available, only two of the participating districts dropped elementary school counseling. In each case the reason was simply lack of funds. Each hoped this would be a temporary situation and expressed hope that the program would be continued in the near future.